

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/662,847	09/15/2003	Alexander J. Roberts	GP-302409 1208		
7590 02/08/2006		i	EXAM	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER DEVRIES			KLEBE, GERALD B		
General Motors	Corporation		<u></u>		
Mail Code 482-C23-B21			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. Box 300			3618		
Detroit, MI 48	3265-3000				

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/662,847	ROBERTS, ALEXANDER J.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Gerald B. Klebe	3618		

`	Gerald B. Klebe	3618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 24 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliantime periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee lander 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> </ol>	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	onsideration and/or search (see NO <sup>-</sup> ow);	TE below);					
appeal; and/or	tter lotti lot appear by materially re-	ducing or simplifying	lile issues ioi				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	-	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphant / menament	(1 102 024).				
<ul> <li>7. Applicant's reply has everedine the following rejection(s).</li> <li>S. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3, 5-6, 8-10, and 12-16( refer to brid</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ef explanation appended hereto).						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	it before or on the data of filing a Ne	ation of Appeal will be	ot be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affidav	rit or other evidence is	s necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal</li> </ol>	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N MS Cele 31 January 2006	No(s)	Elles				
	2 90000	ZUNGTON					

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/662,847

Art Unit: 3618

Case Serial Number: 10/662847

Advisory Action in Response to Applicant's Amendment After Final filed 01/24/2006

**CONTINUATION SHEET** 

In further explanation of item 7 as expressed on PTOL-303 stating that, for purposes of appeal

the proposed amendments filed 01/24/2006 would be entered, the following brief explanation of

how these amended claims would be rejected is provided:

Upon entry of the amendment filed 01/24/2006 Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10, and 12-16 are

pending; claims 2, 4, 7, and 11 being cancelled by Applicant.

Applicant's arguments notwithstanding, claims 1, 3, and 5-6 drawn to a regenerative

braking system for a vehicle are rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Tamai et al.

(US 6307277) in view of Bhavsar et al. (US 6691807).

Applicant's arguments notwithstanding, claims 8-10 and 12, drawn to a method of

charging and discharging a battery in a vehicle are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious

over Tamai et al. (US 630277) in view of Bhavsar et al. (US 6691807).

Applicant's arguments notwithstanding, claims 13-16, drawn to a method of operating a

vehicle having a regenerative braking system are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious

over Tamai et al. (US 630277) in view of Bhavsar et al. (US 6691807).

Applicant's Remarks as filed 01/24/2006 will be fully addressed in detail to further

support the examiner's conclusions of rejections of the claims under 35 USC 103.

MATChe PK lehe / Art Unit 3618 / 31 January 2006